



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/585,697	04/27/2007	Norman Victor Stenning	4295-00023	4308
7590	10/05/2010		EXAMINER	
Andrus, Sceales, Starke & Sawall 100 East Wisconsin Avenue Suite 1100 Milwaukee, WI 53202-4178			FISHER, MICHAEL J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3689	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/05/2010	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/585,697	STENNING, NORMAN VICTOR
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	MICHAEL J. FISHER	3689

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 35-74 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 35-74 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.	

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Priority***

Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application filed in the United Kingdom on 6/17/2004. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the foreign application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

The examiner will note that it appears that applicant filed the papers, however, they were either not properly identified or not properly filed and therefore, while the UK application is in the file, it is not properly identified as foreign priority papers. As the examiner is unsure why this is so, he is notifying the applicant that there has been a problem with these papers.

***Information Disclosure Statement***

Applicant provided a search report for the related PCT reference but did not supply an information disclosure statement including the references cited. Therefore, unless the reference is cited by the examiner, it has not been considered by the examiner.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 35-39, 41,43-46,48,53-60,62-67 and 72-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US PAT 6,259,786 to Sim.

As to claims 35,57,74, Sim discloses a queue management system (title) for controlling movement of a group of one or more through a virtual queue, (col 1, line 36-39) with registration means (col 2, lines 1-13), comprising an information carrier (portable module, col 2, lines 3-5), at least one ID tag (col 3, lines 30-33), the ID indicates the group size (col 16, lines 58-60), an interface unit for enabling communications (figs 2,4), a processor that is responsive to communications and for generating a registration code (in box 40 of fig 4) which further tracks location (col 3, lines 1-5), and triggers a summons signal that initiates communications (fig 3), access control apparatus at the service for reading the ID tag ("detect "in cradle"", in box 40 of fig 4), that evaluates whether access should be permitted ("turnstile only allows access to responding prompter holders" as seen pointing at 101 in fig 7).

As to claims 36,56, the registration means includes ID tags for each member of the group (claim 32).

As to claim 37, the ID tag is a portable tab (Qtags, line 17, lines 6-8)).

As to claims 38,59, the tag includes a scannable code (it is "scanned" by radio, col 16, lines 64-66).

As to claims 39, 60, the tag is stored in memory ( col 3, lines 30-33).

As to claim 41, as the code is in a computer, it must be alphanumeric.

As to claims 43,62, the device is a “registration pack” with information carrier (the information on the group) and ID tag (as previously discussed).

As to claim 44, there is a registration station (col 15, lines 11-16).

As to claims 45,64, there is audio/visual communication (col 18, lines 32-35, paragraph labeled “1”).

As to claims 46,65, the system tracks numbers in the queue (col 11, lines 56-61).

As to claims 48,67. the system tracks timing of queues (col 4, lines 46-65).

As to claims 53,72, the virtual queue eventually joins the actual queue (as the person arrives at the ride), and tracks their place in the queue (col 11, lines 56-61).

As to claims 54, 55,73, the system stores, changes and arranges itineraries (col 17, lines 56-64).

As to claim 58, each member gets a tag (col 16, lines 51-55).

As to claim 63, the Ids are given via a "computer recognition process" (wherein the computer "recognizes" the account and provides the code).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 40, 42,47,49-52, 61 and 68-71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sim.

As to claims 40,61, biometric information on IDS is old and well known in the art and therefore, it would have been obvious to use biometric information as this would further ensure the person using the device is the proper user.

As to claim 42, Sim does not teach using a credit card for an ID. Sim does teach using credit card readers for registration (col 18, lines 1-2), therefore, it would have been obvious to use the credit card as ID as the system already reads the cards and they are uniquely tied to an individual or group (such as married couples or parents who give a card to their children).

As to claims 47, the system tracks user movement through a queue (as discussed and further, col 2, line 66-col 3, line 21), it would be obvious to calculate a value for this as computers use values to compute.

As to claims 49,66, it would be obvious to calculate a "throughput profile" and calculate values on this to track customer satisfaction and how well the system is working, otherwise, it could be working poorly and this would not be known.

As to claims 50,69, it would be obvious to use records of service to ensure the system is working properly.

As to claims 51,70, as the system tracks users using queues, it would track actual service throughput, it would be obvious to save this data as this could be used to track performance.

As to claims 52,71, it would be obvious to continue calculating the value as this would track performance.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL J. FISHER whose telephone number is (571)272-6804. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 7:30am-5:00pm alt Fri. off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janice Mooneyham can be reached on 571-272-6805. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael J Fisher/  
Examiner, Art Unit 3689  
MF  
9/30/10